

REMARKS

In an Office Action dated November 3, 2003, claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shibota et al (2002/1034909). Shibota discloses an external calibration system for calibrating light emitting elements in an optical print mechanism. However, Shibota does not disclose a printbar nor the detailed methods used by an internal photosensor to maintain calibration over the life of the printer. Shibota is primarily concerned with assembly of the printer and calibration at the time of assembly. Shibota does disclose an internal photosensor that may use the external calibration system as a reference, but does not describe the methods and use of the internal photosensor. Instead, Shibota describes having the internal photosensor generate a control signal that is used to control the LED light source. Thus Shibota does not disclose an internal photosensor that receives a signal to recalibrate the printbar, recalibrates the printbar and then saves the recalibrated current values as described in the original dependent claims 2, 9, 15 and 18. The limitation of those dependent claims has been written into independent claims 1, 8, 14 and 17.

In addition, because Shibota does not discuss the details of the process for recalibrating the LEDs after initial calibration using the internal photodetector, Shibota cannot anticipate other details of the independent claims including the operation of switching all LEDs off as described in claim 17.

In addition to the independent claims, Applicant respectfully submits that Shibota does not disclose the operation or system described in various dependent claims. For example, Applicant respectfully submits that many of the descriptions, such as claim 13 of Shibota (which claims at least 5 photodetectors) refer to the detectors in the calibration device, not a photodetector "integrated into said printer" as claimed. In fact, Applicant respectfully submits that Shibota makes no mention of the structure of the internal photodetector integrated into said printer. Thus Shibota is insufficient for making a prima facie case of anticipation for claims 4 (claiming a photodetector running the length of the printer), or even a second integrated photodetector as in claims 5.

Application No. 10/025,484

Regarding claim 19, Shibota clearly teaches away from using the same internal detector as the detector for calibration during assembly AND as the detector for use during later testing as the LED decays. Thus, the Shibota reference is insufficient to render a prima facie case of obviousness with respect to claim 19.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim as amended are allowable over the cited prior art reference, and allowance at Examiner's earliest convenience is hereby respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner believes a teleconference would facilitate prosecution, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Kent Chen
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 39,630
(310) 333-3663
March 3, 2004